DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 401 265 SP 037 016

AUTHOR Ganser, Tom
TITLE Teacher Effectiveness: Views of Preservice and Inservice Teachers.
PUB DATE Oct 96
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, October 5, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Environment; Education Majors; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Self Efficacy; *Student Characteristics; *Student Teacher Attitudes; Student Teachers; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Student Relationship; Teaching Conditions; Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS Experienced Teachers; *Preservice Teachers; Teacher Principal Relationship

ABSTRACT

Exploring the beliefs and ideas that preservice and inservice teachers hold about themselves as teachers, the children they teach, and the setting in which they teach, contributes to a better understanding of how they frame teacher effectiveness and teacher efficacy. Participants in this study included preservice teachers enrolled in teacher preparation programs at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater and inservice teachers employed in three school districts in Wisconsin. The students in the study represented three different stages of teacher preparation field experience. The survey required participants to distribute 100 points among 10 factors that can be associated with the overall effectiveness of a teacher. The study reveals some very strong patterns. All respondents consistently indicated by their distribution of points that teacher factors (intelligence, personality, background, and preparation program) contribute more to the overall effectiveness of teachers, and disproportionately so, than pupil factors (intelligence, personality, and background) or other person factors (other teachers, principal, other school professionals). The study also suggests that the respondents view other persons working in a school, including teachers, the principals, and other professionals such as guidance counselors, as having relatively little part in the overall effectiveness of a teacher. The survey instrument and data tables are included in the appendix. (Contains 25 references.) (ND)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 401 265

Teacher Effectiveness: Views of Preservice and Inservice Teachers

Tom Ganser

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Ganser

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

October 5, 1996

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This paper was prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association on October 5, 1996 in Chicago, Illinois.

The author welcomes responses to this paper by contacting him at:

Tom Ganser, Director
Office of Field Experiences
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
800 West Main Street
Whitewater, Wisconsin 53190

Office: (414) 472-1123

Fax: (414) 472-5716

Internet: gansert@uwwvax.uww.ed

S1637016

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teacher Effectiveness: Views of Preservice and Inservice Teachers

Teacher effectiveness has been a mainstay of research on teaching for nearly three decades (Doyle, 1990; Good, 1996; Shavelson, Webb, & Burnstein, 1984). However, over time the focus of the research has expanded beyond primarily a process-product orientation to one that includes teacher cognition, expert/novice comparisons, conceptualization of subject matter, student mediation, and most recently the constructionist perspective and teaching for understanding (Good, 1996). Emphasizing schools as organizations, for example, Darling-Hammond and Sclan (1996) have noted that "the manner in which schools organize teachers' and students' work may have more of an impact on teachers' effectiveness and decisions to stay in teaching than many other factors" (p. 90).

Teacher effectiveness has also been related to teachers' beliefs about the efficacy of their work. Cohen (1987) pointed out that "Effective teachers have a high sense of efficacy; they believe that they are effective and can affect the learning of students" (p. 479). Citing Aston and Webb (1986), Good and Brophy (1994) elaborated on this association between teachers' sense of efficacy and their beliefs about their work:

> Teachers who were high in sense of efficacy believed that they were capable of motivating and instructing student successfully. Teachers who were low in sense of efficacy believed either that no teachers could have important effects (because students' motivations and performance depends mostly on their home environments) or that some teachers could have such effects but they personally could not (presumably because they lacked needed knowledge or skills). (p. 104)

The connection between efficacy and effectiveness demonstrates the expanding

emphasis in research on teaching from a process-product orientation to one that recognizes the influence of teacher cognition and especially teacher beliefs on teaching. In considering teachers' beliefs, however, it is important to bear in mind Pajeres's (1992) caution that "beliefs" is a generic term associated with values, attitudes, judgments, opinions, ideologies, perceptions, conceptions, conceptual systems, preconceptions, dispositions, implicit theories, personal theories, and perspectives. In a recent review of research on teachers' beliefs and knowledge, Calderhead (1996) outlined five main areas in which the teachers' many untested assumptions (i.e., beliefs) "influence how they think about classroom matters and respond to classroom matters" (p. 719), including beliefs about (1) learners and learning, (2) teaching, (3) subject, (4) learning to teach, and (5) self and the teaching role.

Recognition of the importance of beliefs in inservice teachers is complemented by a recognition of the importance of beliefs in preservice teachers (Borko & Putnam, 1996; Brookhart & Freeman, 1992; Feiman-Nemser & Remillard, 1996; Howey & Zimpher, 1996). According to Richardson (1996):

> The research on the role of attitude and beliefs in learning to teach present a picture of preservice students who enter their initial teacher preparation program with strong, or perhaps even central, beliefs about teaching, learning, subject matter, and students. (p. 113).

The interaction between beliefs and teacher preparation is perhaps most evident during field experiences and especially student teaching (Kennedy, 1996). Knowles and Cole (1996) have emphasized that "Preservice teachers often have well-rooted images of themselves as teachers and high ideals and aspirations for teaching, and they strive to enact or play out their

personal images despite contextual realities that are often at odds with them" (p. 654). They also noted that without promoting reflection and inquiry in students in conjunction with their field experiences, "unexamined constructs are likely to remain unchallenged, therefore static and potentially unreflected-upon elements of practice" (p. 654). On the one hand, researchers question the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs in general to influence the beliefs that education majors bring to their preparation programs (Floden, 1995); on the other hand, others suggest that the socialization of beginning teachers in schools is sometimes powerful enough to "wash out" or at least reduce whatever influence their preparation programs may have had on their pre-existing beliefs in the first place (Zeicher & Gore, 1990; Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981).

Exploring the beliefs and ideas that preservice and inservice teachers hold about themselves as teachers, the children they teach, and the setting in which they teach contributes to a better understanding of how they frame teacher effectiveness and teacher efficacy. Articulating the relationship between teacher belief and teacher behavior is complex, but efforts to elucidate what teachers believe about central features of their work can contribute to a better understanding of teaching.

Method

Participants

The participants in this study included preservice teachers enrolled in teacher preparation programs at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater and inservice teachers employed in three school districts in Wisconsin. UW-Whitewater is a comprehensive university in the University of Wisconsin System and serves approximately 2200 majors in the

College of Education, primarily in teacher preparation programs.

The students in this study represented three different stages of teacher preparation. (1) Observation and Participation students were enrolled in the first early field experience program that included a 50 hour field experience in a Milwaukee public school, scheduled as one day per week for eight weeks. During this field experiences, the students, predominantly sophomores, were enrolled in a block of three courses, Education in a Pluralistic Society, Child Development or Educational Psychology, and Observation and Participation. Additional information about this program can be found in Epps (in press), Ganser (1995, 1996), and Epps and Ganser (1993). (2) Students in Field Study were in the second early field experience required of regular education majors, following Observation and Participation and preceding Student Teaching. During Field Study students were concurrently enrolled in methods courses. The field component of Field Study consisted of 75 hours in a school, scheduled as approximately 2½ hours per day for six to seven weeks. (3) Student Teachers were participating in the final required experience, scheduled as full day, full semester, following the schedule of the school district, not the university.

The inservice teachers participating in the study were employed in three Wisconsin school districts. At the time of the study, enrollment in the districts was approximately 1300 for the Pine School District, 2100 for the Willow School District, and 2700 for the Maple School District. (Note: pseudonyms used for the school districts).

Survey and Procedure

During the Spring, 1996, semester, a survey was administered to both the preservice and the inservice teachers. In addition to requesting demographic information, the survey

required participants to distribute 100 points among ten factors that can be associated with the overall effectiveness of a teacher, as displayed in the Appendix. Surveys in which the total number of points did not equal 100 were returned for correction. In addition, a second survey was sent to non-respondents approximately three weeks after the original deadline had passed.

One hundred fifty-five Observation and Participation students and 85 Field Study students were surveyed. A random sample half of 201 Student Teachers was surveyed.

Insert Table 1 about here.

Random samples of fifty inservice teachers in each of the three school districts were surveyed, representing 28%, 39%, and 49% of the teachers employed in the Maple, Willow, and Pine School Districts, respectively. The response rate for useable surveys was 61.76% for students and 62.86% for the inservice teachers. Specific information regarding response rate is displayed in Table 1.

Results

Data resulting from the survey were analyzed using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). In addition to providing the mean number of points and standard deviation for each of ten factors, a sum of the four factors associated with teachers (F1, F2, F3, F4), the three factors associated with pupils (F5, F6, F7), and three factors associated with other persons (viz, teachers, principals, other professionals) working in a school (F8, F9, F10) was also calculated. Each factor was also rank ordered based on number of points assigned.

In this paper, "teacher factors" generally refers to the sum of factors F1, F2, F3, and F4,

"pupil factors" to the sum of factors F5, F6, and F7, and "other person factors" refers to the sum of factors F8, F9, and F10, as provided at the bottom of the tables.

Preservice teachers.

Among the ten factors presented, education majors at all three levels of experience assigned more points to F2 (teacher personality) to account for a teacher's overall effectiveness

---

Insert Table 2 about here.

---

than to any other factor, as displayed in Table 2. Observation and Participation (hereafter O&P) students assigned at least twice as many points (17.08) to F2 (teacher personality) than to F5 (pupil intelligence) or to any other person factors. This pattern was even more pronounced for Field Study students, who assigned at least twice as many points (19.97) to F2 (teacher personality) than to all other factors except for F1 (teacher intelligence) and F4 (teacher preparation program). The results for Student Teachers were similar to that of Field Study students, although the number of points assigned to F2 (teacher personality) was slightly less at 19.79.

The rank order of the ten factors varied somewhat across the three levels of education majors. Rank order was identical for F2 (teacher personality) and F3 (teacher background); varied by one for F1 (teacher intelligence), F4 (teacher preparation program), and F5 (pupil intelligence); and varied by several positions for the other five factors.

In considering the total points assigned to teacher factors, pupil factors, and other person factors, all three groups of preservice teachers assigned more than twice as many points

to teacher factors than to pupil or other person factors. The number of points assigned to teacher factors increased from O&P students (54.44) to Field Study students (56.92) to Student Teachers (57.73), whereas the number of points assigned to pupil factors decreased from O&P students (24.07) to Field Study students (22.22) to Student Teachers (20.23). Field Study students assigned fewer points (20.86) to other person factors than did O&P students (21.49) or Student Teachers (22.05).

When analyzed according to teaching category, both regular education majors (18.88) and special education majors (16.93) assigned more points to F2 (teacher personality) than to any other factors. In fact, special education majors assigned twice as many points to F2

Insert Table 3 about here.

(teacher personality) than to F3, F5, F6, F7, F8, and F10; the same was true for regular education majors, who also assigned fewer than half of the points assigned to F2 to F9 (principal). In terms of all factors associated with teachers, pupils, or other persons, both

---

Insert Table 4 about here.

---

regular and special education majors assigned more points to teacher factors than to pupil or other person factors. Special education majors viewed other person factors (24.00) as accounting more for teacher effectiveness than pupil factors (20.50), whereas regular education majors assigned more points to pupil factors (22.88) than to other person factors (20.66). It

should also be noted that, like special education majors, regular education PreK-Grade 6 and K-12 majors also assigned slightly more points to other person factors than to pupil factors (Table 4).

As displayed in Table 4, all regular education majors assigned more points to F2 (teacher personality) than to any other factor, mirroring the results reported thus far. Looking at rank based on assigned points, there was considerable variation across the four regular education majors. Although all four majors rank F2 (teacher personality) number one, the rank for F3 (teacher background) varied from 4 to 7, and the rank for F9 (principal) varied from 4 to 8. All regular education majors assigned more points to teacher factors than to pupil or other person factors, but K-12 majors (art, music, physical education) assigned considerably more points to teacher factors (60.48) than did PreK-Grade 6 (54.42), Grades 1-6 and Grades 1-9 (56.24), or Grades 6-12 (56.37) majors. Conversely, K-12 majors assigned fewer points to student factors (19.70) than PreK-Grade 6 (22.18), Grades 1-6 and Grades 1-9 (23.69) and Grades 6-12 (23.95) majors.

Inservice teachers.

As indicated in Table 2, inservice teachers distributed 59.18 points among the four teacher factors, with F2 (teacher personality) ranked first, F1 (teacher intelligence) ranked second, F4 (teacher preparation program) ranked third, and F3 (teacher background) ranked fourth. They also assigned at least twice as many points to F2 (teacher intelligence) than to any of the pupil or other person factors.

Comparing regular education teachers and special education teachers, as displayed in Table 3, both groups assigned most points to teacher factors, followed by student factors and

other person factors. Although both groups ranked F2 (teacher personality) first, F1 (teacher intelligence) second, and F4 (teacher preparation program) third, they differed in their ranking for F3 (teacher background), which was ranked fourth by regular education teachers, but fifth by special education teachers, behind F7 (pupil background).

When the data for inservice teachers are examined by level, as displayed in Table 5, it can been seen that regardless of level, teachers assigned more points to teacher factors than to pupil factors or other person factors. Based on points assigned, the top three factors for all three levels of teachers were ranked identically: first F2 (teacher personality), second F1 (teacher intelligence), and third F4 (teacher preparation). The rank for F10 (other professionals) was also identical, at tenth. The most notable difference in ranking was for F7 (pupil background), which was ranked fourth by middle school teachers, fifth by elementary school teachers, and seventh by high school teachers. Also, the difference between the mean number of points assigned to teacher factors and the mean number of points assigned to student

---

Insert Table 5 about here.

---

factors varied considerably among the three levels of inservice teachers, with elementary teachers assigning 41.76 more points, high school teachers assigning 35.72 more points, and middle school teachers assigning 28.00 more points to teacher factors than to pupil factors.

Comparing preservice and inservice teachers.

As indicated in Table 2, preservice and inservice teachers assigned a higher number of points to teacher factors than to either pupil factors or other person factors. The greatest

differences are in teacher factors where teachers assigned 3.33 more points, on average, than did education majors, and other person factors, where inservice teachers assigned 2.96 fewer points, on average, than education majors. However, based on assigned points, the rank order for each factor is identical for preservice and inservice teachers.

The data provided in Table 3 permits a comparison of preservice and inservice teachers according to category (i.e., regular or special education). In terms of the greatest differences, regular education teachers assigned 3.15 more points to teacher factors than regular education majors, and special education teachers assigned 3.79 fewer points to other person factors than special education majors. In addition, whereas regular education majors and teachers assigned the most points to teacher factors followed by pupil factors and then other person factors, special education majors and special education teachers were similar only in assigning the most points to teacher factors. Special education majors assigned more points to other person factors than to pupil factors and the reverse was true for special education teachers.

Finally, some useful comparison can be made between preservice regular education majors based on program (Table 4) and inservice teachers based on level (Table 5). Several of the greatest differences for teacher, pupil, and other person factors emerge in making these comparisons. For example, PreK-6 majors assigned 7.14 fewer points to teacher factors, 2.38 more points to pupil factors, and 4.74 more points to other person factors than did elementary school teachers. The pattern is same for Grades 1-6 and Grades 1-9 majors who typically intend to teach in elementary schools. The same pattern also emerges in comparing Grades 6-12 majors who typically intend to teach in high school and high school teachers, but the differences are less. Compared to the high school teachers, Grades 6-12 majors assigned 2.36

fewer points to teacher factors, 0.76 more points to pupil factors, and 1.77 more points to other person factors.

Discussion

This study reveals some very strong patterns. First, regardless of the group, all respondents consistently indicated by their distribution of points that teacher factors (intelligence, personality, background, and preparation program) contribute more to the overall effectiveness of teachers, and disproportionately so, than pupil factors (intelligence, personality, and background) or other person factors (other teachers, principal, other school professionals). Ironically, the two single most important factors F2 (teacher personality) and F1 (teacher intelligence), which generally represented at least a third of the 100 points distributed by respondents among the ten factors, are aspects of prospective teachers that teacher preparation programs cannot significantly affect. On the one hand, this may be interpreted as suggesting that teachers are in control of their effectiveness and efficacy. On the other hand, to the extent that teacher personality and intelligence are linked to teacher effectiveness and efficacy, this study suggest that getting good teachers into classrooms may be more a matter of identification and selection than a matter of training or preparation.

The study also indicates that the respondents view other persons working in a school, including teachers, the principal, and other professionals such as guidance counselors, as having relatively little part in the overall effectiveness of a teacher. This suggests that both preservice and inservice teachers have beliefs that will continue to be troubling obstacles in transforming schools into professional learning communities (Jenlink, Kinnucan-Welsch, & Odell, 1996; Lieberman, 1996).

The study also shows that there is considerable variability in terms of how much weight respondents gave to each of the ten factors. This is evident in Table 6, where the rank orders for each of the factors as displayed in Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 are combined. Although there is

---

Insert Table 6 about here.

---

no variation in rank order for F2 (teacher personality), ranked one, and very the minimum variation in rank order for F1 (teacher intelligence) and F4 (teacher background), both ranked either second or third, the range in rank order for the other factors ranges from three positions for F5 (pupil intelligence) to six positions for F7 (pupil background) and F9 (principal).

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the study comes in examining the pattern of responses for preservice teachers at three different levels of experience relative to inservice teachers, as displayed in Table 2. In the case of F4 (teacher preparation program), F8 (other teachers), and F9 (principal), there is an upward trend. That is, Field Study students assigned more points to these factors than O&P students, and Student Teachers assign more points to these factors than Field Study students, in accounting for overall teacher effectiveness. In comparison, the inservice teachers, assigned fewer points to F4 (teacher preparation program) and F8 (other teachers) than did education majors in O&P at the earliest stage of their professional preparation program, and they assigned only 0.06 more points to F9 (principal) than did O&P students. The impact of the workplace on teachers may be inferred for those factors in which the upward trend established over preservice preparation is essentially reversed by respondents who are inservice teachers, as is the case for F4 (teacher preparation

program), F8 (other teachers), and F9 (principal).

There are also downward trends across the three levels of education majors for four factors, F3 (teacher background), F5 (pupil intelligence), F6 (pupil personality), and F10 (other professionals). In the cases of F5 (pupil intelligence) and F6 (pupil personality), inservice teachers assigned fewer points than Student Teachers but more points than Field Study students. In the case of F10 (other professionals), inservice teachers continued the downward trend, assigning even fewer points to this factor than student teachers.

References

Aston, P., & Webb, R. (1986). Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement. New York: Longman.

Borko, H., & Putnam, R. T. (1996). Learning to teach. In D. C. Berliner & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), Handbook of educational psychology (pp. 673-708). New York: Macmillan.

Brookhart, S., & Freeman, C. (1992). Characteristics of entering teacher candidates. Review of Educational Research, 62, 37-60.

Calderhead, J. (1996). Teachers: Beliefs and knowledge. In D. C. Berliner & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), Handbook of educational psychology (pp. 709-725). New York: Macmillan.

Cohen, M. (1987). Improving school effectiveness: Lessons for research. In V. Richardson-Koehler (Ed.), Educators' handbook: A research perspective (pp. 474-490). New York: Longman.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Sclan, E. M. (1996). Who teachers and why: Dilemmas of building a profession for the twenty-first century. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education (2nd ed.) (pp. 67-101). New York: Macmillan.

Doyle, W. (1990). Themes in teacher education research. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 3-24), New York: Macmillan.

Epps, M. V. (in press). Pre-professional block incorporating field experience and systematic observation. Teaching Education.

Epps, M. V., & Ganser, T. (1993). Providing an urban field experience for students attending a rural teacher preparation institution. Paper presented at the meeting of the

Association of Teacher Educators, Los Angeles, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 355 231).

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Remillard, J. (1996). Perspectives on learning to teach. In F. B. Murray (Ed.), The teacher educator's handbook: Building a knowledge base for the preparation of teachers (pp. 63-91). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Floden, R. E. (1995, July-August). Confrontation of teachers' entering beliefs. ATE [Association of Teacher Educators] Newsletter, 28(6), 4.

Ganser, T. (1995). The Milwaukee Experience. In Changing course: Teacher education reform at state colleges and universities, 214-215. American Association of State Colleges and Universities: Washington, DC.

Ganser, T. (1996). Students' perceptions of appropriate placements for an early field experience. The Journal of the Southeastern Regional Association of Teacher Educators, 5(2), 24-31.

Good, T. L. (1996). Teaching effects and teacher evaluation. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education (2nd ed.) (pp. 617-665). New York: Macmillan.

Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (1994). Looking in classrooms (6th ed.). New York: HarperCollins.

Howey, K. R., & Zimpher, N. L. (1996). Patterns in prospective teachers: Guides for designing preservice program. In F. B. Murray (Ed.), The teacher educator's handbook: Building a knowledge base for the preparation of teachers (pp. 465-505). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Jenlink, P. M., Kinnucan-Welsch, K., & Odell, S. J. (1996). Designing professional development learning communities. In D. J. McIntyre & D. M. Byrd (Eds.), Preparing tomorrow's teachers: The field experience (pp. 63-86). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Lieberman, A. (1996). Practices that support teacher development: Transforming conceptions of professional learning. In M. W. McLaughlin & I. Oberman (Eds.), Teacher learning: New policies, new practices (pp. 185-201). New York: Teachers College.

Kennedy, M. M. (1996). Research genres in teacher education. In F. B. Murray (Ed.), The teacher educator's handbook: Building a knowledge base for the preparation of teachers (pp. 120-152). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Knowles, J. G., & Cole, A. L. (1996). Developing practice through field experiences. In F. B. Murray (Ed.), The teacher educator's handbook: Building a knowledge base for the preparation of teachers (648-688). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. Review of Educational Research, 62(3), 307-332.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education (2nd ed.) (pp. 102-119). New York: Macmillan.

Shavelson, R. J., Webb, N. M., & Burnstein, L. (1984). Measurement of teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 50-91). New York: Macmillan.

Zeichner, K. M., & Gore, J. M. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 329-348). New York: Macmillan.

Zeichner, K. M., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education "washed out" by school experience? Journal of Teacher Education, 32(3), 7-11.

Appendix

Survey Directions and Items

Directions: Please **distribute 100 points** among the following ten factors according to how important you believe each factor is in accounting for the overall effectiveness of a teacher. The more points you assign to a factor, the more important you believe that factor is. ***Be sure that the total number of points you assign equals 100.***

	Factor		Assigned points
F1.	The teacher's own intelligence	1.	_____
F2.	The teacher's own personality	2.	_____
F3.	The teacher's own background (parents, previous schooling, socioeconomic status, etc.)	3.	_____
F4.	The teacher's teacher preparation program (education courses, field experiences, etc.)	4.	_____
F5.	The intelligence of the teacher's pupils/students	5.	_____
F6.	The personality of the teacher's pupils/students	6.	_____
F7.	The background of the teacher's pupils/students (parents, previous schooling, socioeconomic status, etc.)	7.	_____
F8.	The other teachers working in the teacher's school	8.	_____
F9.	The principal of the teacher's school	9.	_____
F10.	Other professionals working in the teacher's school (e.g., guidance counselor)	10.	_____
		Total (must equal 100)	_____

Table 1

Populations surveyed and response rates

Group	Total population	Total surveyed	Useable surveys	Response rate
PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS				
Observation and Participation	155	155	111	71.61%
Field Study	85	85	37	43.53%
Student Teaching	201	100[1]	62	62.00%
TOTAL	**441**	**340**	**210**	**61.76%**
INSERVICE TEACHERS				
Maple School District	176	50[1]	34	68.00%
Pine School District	103	50[1]	36	72.00%
Willow School District	128	50[1]	28	56.00%
TOTAL	**407**	**150**	**98**	**65.33%**
GRAND TOTAL	***846***	***490***	***308***	***62.86%***

[1]Random sample

Table 2

Points assigned to effectiveness factors by respondents according to preservice or inservice status

	Preservice and Inservice Status																			
Factor	Obs & Part				Field Study				Student Teaching				Total Preservice				Total Inservice			
	n	mean	sd	rank	n	mean	sd	rank	n	mean	sd	rank	n	mean	sd	rank	n	mean	sd	rank
F1	111	14.38	5.97	2	37	13.73	7.03	3	62	14.27	7.17	3	210	14.23	6.51	2	98	15.28	7.20	2
F2	111	17.08	6.42	1	37	19.97	10.40	1	62	19.79	9.34	1	210	18.39	8.23	1	98	21.81	10.20	1
F3	111	9.15	5.41	4	37	9.05	4.50	4	62	9.00	6.26	4	210	9.09	5.51	4	98	9.39	5.29	4
F4	111	13.83	6.38	3	37	14.16	7.03	2	62	14.66	9.25	2	210	14.13	7.42	3	98	12.71	6.85	3
F5	111	6.93	3.15	10	37	6.89	5.07	9	62	5.19	3.87	9	210	6.41	3.82	9	98	6.18	4.22	9
F6	111	8.60	4.41	5	37	8.00	4.36	5	62	7.35	4.25	8	210	8.13	4.37	5	98	8.10	6.07	5
F7	111	8.54	4.38	6	37	7.32	3.99	8	62	7.68	5.88	7	210	8.07	4.82	6	98	7.95	5.51	6
F8	111	7.03	3.46	9	37	7.59	3.59	6	62	7.79	3.49	6	210	7.35	3.49	8	98	6.19	3.63	8
F9	111	7.42	3.36	7	37	7.54	3.65	7	62	8.63	4.47	5	210	7.80	3.79	7	98	7.48	4.91	7
F10	111	7.04	3.31	8	37	5.73	3.22	10	62	5.63	3.37	10	210	6.39	3.37	10	98	4.91	3.05	10
Sum F1-F4	111	54.44	11.48		37	56.92	13.19		62	57.73	13.00		210	55.85	12.29		98	59.18	14.44	
Sum F5-F7	111	24.07	8.37		37	22.22	10.49		62	20.23	10.62		210	22.61	9.57		98	22.23	10.84	
Sum F8-F10	111	21.49	7.96		37	20.86	8.55		62	22.05	7.73		210	21.54	7.97		98	18.58	8.77	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3

Points assigned to effectiveness factors by respondents according to category of teaching

	Teaching category															
Factor	Preservice-Regular Ed				Preservice-Special Ed				Inservice- Regular Ed				Inservice-Special Ed			
	n	mean	sd	rank	n	mean	sd	rank	n	mean	sd	rank	n	mean	sd	rank
F1	170	14.40	6.54	2	28	14.21	7.23	3	83	15.51	7.45	2	14	14.21	5.79	2
F2	170	18.88	8.26	1	28	16.93	8.14	1	83	21.88	10.83	1	14	21.71	7.04	1
F3	170	9.12	5.76	4	28	8.46	3.48	5	83	9.59	5.57	4	14	8.14	3.32	5
F4	170	14.06	7.12	3	28	15.89	9.41	2	83	12.64	7.09	3	14	13.29	5.72	3
F5	170	6.55	3.83	9	28	5.50	3.69	10	83	6.14	4.43	8	14	6.14	2.85	9
F6	170	8.25	4.48	5	28	7.64	4.00	7	83	8.04	6.28	5	14	7.86	4.50	6
F7	170	8.07	4.77	6	28	7.36	5.61	8	83	7.87	5.61	6	14	8.43	5.27	4
F8	170	7.11	3.52	8	28	7.93	3.21	6	83	6.12	3.65	9	14	6.64	3.71	8
F9	170	7.54	3.78	7	28	8.86	4.22	4	83	7.46	5.17	7	14	7.79	3.26	7
F10	170	6.02	3.19	10	28	7.21	3.56	9	83	4.76	3.12	10	14	5.79	2.64	10
Sum F1-F4	170	56.46	11.97		28	55.50	14.49		83	59.61	15.01		14	57.36	11.10	
Sum F5-F7	170	22.88	9.26		28	20.50	11.72		83	22.05	11.28		14	22.43	7.82	
Sum F8-F10	170	20.66	7.83		28	24.00	7.59		83	18.34	8.98		14	20.21	7.88	

Table 4

Points assign to effectiveness factors by preservice respondents according to major

	Preservice regular education major															
Factor	Pre-K - Grade 6				Grades 1-6 & 1-9				Grades 6-12				Grades K-12			
	n	mean	sd	rank	n	mean	sd	rank	n	mean	sd	rank	n	mean	sd	rank
F1	38	13.05	5.64	3	45	13.78	6.55	2	59	14.14	6.56	2	27	18.07	6.80	2
F2	38	18.79	8.79	1	45	19.31	10.32	1	59	18.61	6.94	1	27	19.00	6.66	1
F3	38	7.63	3.62	7	45	9.84	4.34	4	59	10.20	7.49	4	27	7.81	5.54	5
F4	38	14.95	7.76	2	45	13.31	5.45	3	59	13.42	7.25	3	27	15.59	8.38	3
F5	38	5.89	2.58	10	45	6.93	5.29	9	59	6.83	3.37	9	27	6.30	3.46	9
F6	38	8.87	4.53	5	45	8.38	4.19	5.5	59	8.32	4.93	6	27	6.78	3.56	6
F7	38	7.42	3.81	8	45	8.38	4.69	5.5	59	8.80	5.26	5	27	6.63	4.72	7
F8	38	8.05	3.44	6	45	7.22	3.24	7	59	6.69	3.69	7.5	27	6.37	3.60	8
F9	38	8.95	3.59	4	45	7.09	3.62	8	59	6.69	3.47	7.5	27	8.07	4.50	4
F10	38	6.39	2.86	9	45	5.76	3.48	10	59	6.29	3.18	10	27	5.37	3.25	10
Sum F1-4	38	54.42	11.18		45	56.24	11.49		59	56.37	12.48		27	60.48	12.22	
Sum F5-7	38	22.18	7.14		45	23.69	10.35		59	23.95	10.06		27	19.70	7.57	
Sum 8-10	38	23.39	7.85		45	20.07	6.60		59	19.68	8.09		27	19.81	8.72	

Table 5

Points assigned by inservice respondents according to level

	Inservice level											
Factor	Elementary School				Middle School				High School			
	n	mean	sd	rank	n	mean	sd	rank	n	mean	sd	rank
F1	45	15.93	7.13	2	18	14.67	6.42	2	32	14.78	7.79	2
F2	45	21.62	10.94	1	18	19.72	7.43	1	32	23.66	10.97	1
F3	45	9.71	5.44	4	18	8.44	4.53	6	32	9.72	5.65	4
F4	45	14.29	6.91	3	18	11.28	6.06	3	32	10.75	6.59	3
F5	45	5.47	3.97	9	18	7.72	4.46	8	32	6.28	4.39	8
F6	45	6.98	5.42	7	18	8.61	5.90	5	32	9.34	7.06	5
F7	45	7.36	5.29	5	18	9.78	5.52	4	32	7.56	5.79	7
F8	45	6.18	3.63	8	18	7.22	3.84	9	32	5.69	3.59	9
F9	45	7.31	4.65	6	18	7.88	4.27	7	32	7.88	5.70	6
F10	45	5.16	3.50	10	18	5.11	2.30	10	32	4.34	2.79	10
Sum F1-F4	45	61.56	15.91		18	54.11	13.01		32	58.91	12.36	
Sum F5-F7	45	19.80	10.62		18	26.11	11.12		32	23.19	10.43	
Sum F8-F10	45	18.64	9.25		18	19.78	7.21		32	17.91	9.23	

Table 6

Rank order of factors by points assigned

		Preservice Teachers										Inservice Teachers					
Factor	Mean rank	All pre-service	O&P	FS	StTch	Reg Ed	Spe Ed	PreK-6	1-6, 1-9	6-12	K-12	All in-service	Reg Ed	Spe Ed	Elem School	Middle School	HS School
F1	2.25	2	2	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
F2	1.00	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
F3	4.50	4	4	4	4	4	5	7	4	4	5	4	4	5	4	6	4
F4	2.75	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
F5	9.00	9	10	9	9	9	10	10	9	9	9	9	8	9	9	8	8
F6	5.66	5	5	5	8	5	7	5	5.5	6	6	5	5	6	7	5	5
F7	5.72	6	6	8	7	6	8	8	5.5	5	7	6	6	4	5	4	7
F8	7.66	8	9	6	6	8	6	6	9	7.5	8	8	9	8	8	9	9
F9	6.28	7	7	7	5	7	4	4	8	7.5	4	7	7	7	6	7	6
F10	9.75	10	8	10	10	10	9	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10